

REMARKS

After entry of this amendment claims 1-16 will remain in this case.

The claims have been rejected as anticipated by or obvious over US patent number 6,273,910 to Limon.

The Limon patent states that "for the stent to remain in place on the balloon during delivery to the site of the damage within the artery 15, the stent is tightly crimped onto the balloon. ... Other means for securing the stent onto the balloon may also be used, such as providing collars or ridges on the ends of the working portion, i.e., the cylindrical portion, of the balloon." (8/43-53)

Independent claim 1 has been amended to remove unnecessary limitations and to help clarify what is being claimed. Claim 1 clarifies that the engaging means is affixed at a position **proximal of** the expandable portion of the balloon. In contrast, the Limon patent teaches securing the stent onto the balloon by either crimping it onto the balloon or by providing collars or ridges on the enlarged, cylindrical working portion of the balloon, that is **on** the expandable portion of the balloon. There is nothing in Limon disclosing or suggesting positioning any affixing means proximal of the expandable working portion of the balloon. Rather, doing so would be **contrary to the teachings** of Limon because it would mean that the stent would no longer be carried on top of the balloon and thus would not be expandable by the balloon.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art.

Independent claim 11 has been similarly amended and is allowable for the same basic reasons as claim 1. In addition, claim 11 now specifically recites a polymer layer treated to enhance the grip of the polymer layer to the vascular prosthesis. There is nothing in Limon that discloses or suggests this aspect of the invention. In addition, claim 11 specifies that the polymer layer is affixed **directly to** the elongated member at a position proximal of the balloon. This feature is also completely absent from Limon.

According, independent claim 11 is allowable over the cited art.

The **dependent claims** are directed to specific novel subfeatures of the invention and are allowable for that reason as well as by depending from novel parent claims. For example, Limon fails to suggest a polymer layer treated to enhance frictional engagement as in claim 2.

In light of the above remarks and the amendments to the claims, applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and action to that end is urged. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would aid the prosecution of this case in any way, please call the undersigned at (650) 712-0340. Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments associated with this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0869 (Client Ref. NOCO 1040).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 27 May 2008

/Jonathan Putnam/

Jonathan Putnam, Reg. No. 60,102

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P.O. Box 366
Half Moon Bay, California 94019
Phone: 650-712-0340
Fax: 650-712-0263